UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,377	07/28/2001	Michael S. Allison	10018215-1	9960

22879 7590 08/29/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
PHAM, KHANH B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/917,377	ALLISON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Khanh B. Pham	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 July 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

2. Applicant's submission filed on May 8, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1-3, 14-15, and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the type" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chirashnya et al. (US 6,598,179 B1), hereinafter "Chirashnya".

As per claim 1, Chirashnya teaches a method for processing events from electronic architecture, the architecture of the type having a plurality of entities generating the events comprising the steps of:

- "extracting the events from the architecture" at Col. 2 lines 50-57;
- "separating the events according to the entities" at Col. 5 lines 20-30;
- "transforming the events to one or more text strings" at Col. 6 lines 25-35;
- "outputting the one or more text strings" at Col. 6 lines 25-35 and Fig. 1, 44;
- "wherein each of the events includes system information and context sensitive information" at Col. 11 lines 1-10.

As per claim 2, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of filtering the events to process only events from identified entities" at Col. 5 lines 25-30

As per claim 3, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, wherein "the step of extracting the events comprises extracting chassis logs" at col. 2 lines 6-15, wherein

"the step of separating the events comprises separating the chassis logs" at Col. 5 lines 5-20, wherein "the step of transforming events comprises transforming the chassis logs to text strings" at Col. 6 lines 25-35, and wherein "the chassis log include chassis codes formed of two numbers" at Col. 8 lines 5-30.

As per claim 4, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of "coupling a getcc extraction tool to the architecture" at Col. 2 lines 6-13.

As per claim 6, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, "the architecture being a server, and wherein the step of extracting events from the architecture comprises extracting events from the server" at Col. 4 lines 45-63.

As per claim 7, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, wherein "the step of transforming comprises converting a binary representation of the events to the text strings" at Col. 12 lines 5-20.

As per claim 8, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of "analyzing the text strings and producing a human interpretable statement summarizing at least one of the events associated with the text strings" at Col. 12 lines 5-20.

As per claim 9, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, wherein "the entities comprises one or more of firmware, software, processors, architecture monitors, power monitors, cabinet monitors, and I/O drivers" at Col. 1 lines 26-42.

As per claim 16, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: "the step of saving a log file representative of the events" at Col. 1 lines 25-30.

As per claim 17, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of "transmitting the text strings to one or more analyzers associated with one or more entities and analyzing the text strings at the one or more analyzer" at Col. 12 lines 45-67.

As per claim 18, Chirashnya teaches a system for processing events from electronic architecture, the architecture of the type having a plurality of entities generating the events comprising:

- "a computer including an extraction tool for extracting the events from the architecture, separating the events according to the entities, and transforming the events to one or more text strings for output" at Col. 2 lines 6-60, Col. 5 lines 20-30 and Col. 6 lines 25-35;
- "an interface for coupling the extraction tool to one or more of the architecture and a log file storing the events from the architecture" at Col. 4 lines 45-65;

- "wherein each of the events includes system information and context sensitive information" at Col. 11 lines 1-10.

As per claim 19, Chirashnya teaches the system of claim 18, wherein "the entities comprises one or more of firmware, software, processor, architecture monitors, cabinet monitors, and I/O drivers, and wherein the events comprise chassis logs form one ore more of the firmware, software, processor, architecture monitors, cabinet monitors, and I/O drivers" at Col. 1 lines 25-46.

As per claim 20, Chirashnya teaches a system of claim 18, further comprising one or more analyzers coupled to the extraction tool, the analyzers processing the text strings into one or more human interpretable statements summarizing at least one of the events associated with the text strings" at Col. 12 lines 5-20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 5, 10-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chirashnya as applied to claims 1-9 and 16-20 above, and in view of Leong et al. (US 6,269,398 B1), hereinafter "**Leong**".

As per claim 5, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 4 discussed above. Chirashnya does not explicitly teach "the step of coupling comprises utilizing telnet" as claimed. However, Telnet is a well-known protocol for remote accessing, which is used for requesting diagnostic information from a remote system, as exemplary by Leong at Col. 2, lines 28-40. Leong teaches: "the telnet protocol provides a terminal emulation capability allowing a network manager to issue command (such as command requesting diagnostic information) from other device in the network". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Leong and Chirashnya's teachings so that the diagnostic information could be retrieved not only form a local machine but also from a remote machine. Utilizing telnet to access diagnostic information as suggest by Leong would allow Chirashnya's system to diagnose and provide technical support to remote users.

As per claim 10, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1 as discussed above. Chirashnya does not explicitly teach the step of "controlling one or more steps of extracting, separating, and transforming via one or more command line options". However, using command line options from Telnet program is a well-known method for requesting diagnostic information from a remote system, as exemplary by Leong at Col. 2, lines 28-40. Leong teaches: "the telnet protocol provides a terminal emulation capability allowing a network manager to issue command (such as command requesting diagnostic information) from other device in the network". Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Leong and Chirashnya's teachings so that the diagnostic information could be retrieved not only form a local machine but also from a remote machine. Utilizing telnet to access diagnostic information as suggest by Leong would allow Chirashnya's system to diagnose and provide technical support to remote users.

As per claim 11, Chirashnya and Leong teach the method of claim 10 discussed above. Leong further teaches "controlling one or more steps of extracting, separating, and transforming according to one or more configuration files" at Col. 14 lines 10-40.

As per claim 12, Chirashnya and Leong teach the method of claim 10 discussed above. Leong further teaches the step of "controlling comprises inputting the command line options via a graphic user interface" at Col. 4 lines 15-20.

As per claim 13, Chirashnya and Leong teach the method of claim 10 discussed above. Leong further teaches the step of "controlling comprise updating the command line options automatically from the architecture" at Col. 13 line 65 to Col. 14 line 5.

As per claim 14, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Chirashnya teaches the step of "specifying one ore more cell of the architecture, and extracting the events only from the one or more cells" at Col. 5 lines 25-30, but does not teach: "specifying, as command line option" as claimed. However, using command line

options from Telnet program is a well-known method for requesting diagnostic information from a remote system, as exemplary by Leong at Col. 2, lines 28-40. Leong teaches: "the telnet protocol provides a terminal emulation capability allowing a network manager to issue command (such as command requesting diagnostic information) from other device in the network". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Leong and Chirashnya's teachings so that the diagnostic information could be retrieved not only form a local machine but also from a remote machine. Utilizing telnet to access diagnostic information as suggest by Leong would allow Chirashnya's system to diagnose and provide technical support to remote users.

As per claim 15, Chirashnya teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Chirashnya teaches the step of "specifying one or more processors of the architecture, and extracting the events only from the one or more processors" at Col. 5 lines 25-30; but does not teach: "specifying, as command line options" as claimed. However, using command line options from Telnet program is a well-known method for requesting diagnostic information from a remote system, as exemplary by Leong at Col. 2, lines 28-40. Leong teaches: "the telnet protocol provides a terminal emulation capability allowing a network manager to issue command (such as command requesting diagnostic information) from other device in the network". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Leong and Chirashnya's teachings so that the diagnostic information could be retrieved not only

form a local machine but also from a remote machine. Utilizing telnet to access diagnostic information as suggest by Leong would allow Chirashnya's system to diagnose and provide technical support to remote users.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3574** for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh B. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-4116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Khanh B. Pham
Examiner
Art Unit 2166

August 25, 2006

Kpham